

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter, Figures 1-5).

Claims 1-5, 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yoo et al.* (USPN 6,639,636).

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA as applied to claims 1-5, 8-17 above.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoo et al.* as applied to claims 1-5, 8-17 above.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13. Claims 1-17 are presently pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter, Figures 1-5). Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA as applied to claims 1-5, 8-17 above. Claims 1-5, 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yoo et al.* (USPN 6,639,636). Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoo et al.* as applied to claims 1-5, 8-17 above. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither APA nor *Yoo et al.* teaches or suggests a combination including a main support having an extension part and a supporting member as an integral frame surrounding a plurality of lamps such that the main support defines a plurality of openings in which respective ends of the lamps are inserted, the extension part extends from the openings, and the supporting member supports a liquid crystal panel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13, as amended, is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-12 and 14-17 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, and the reasons set forth above. As explained for example in paragraph [0051] of the specification, by using the claimed configuration of the main support, the liquid crystal display module can be assembled more easily, thereby enhancing productivity.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: August 2, 2006

CUSTOMER NO.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202-739-3000

Fax: 202-739-3001